

Remarks

In the present response, claims 1-36 are presented for examination.

I. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(e)

Claims 1-8, 11-16, 19-23, 26-32, 35, and 36 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by US publication number 2004/0243616 (Benhase). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See MPEP § 2131, also, *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Since Benhase neither teaches nor suggests each element in the claims, these claims are allowable over Benhase.

Claims 1, 19, 29

Claims 1, 19, 29 recite numerous limitations that are not taught or suggested in Benhase. Claim 1 is selected for discussion.

By way of example, claim 1 recites generating a graphical user interface that includes both a tree hierarchy and a table portion. The claim then recites (emphasis added):

including, on the tree hierarchy, nodes at a third level, each third-level node **corresponding to a storage consumer allocated storage capacity on the storage domain**; and

including, on the table portion, the allocated storage capacity used by the storage consumer.

Benhase does not teach or even suggest these recitations. Fig. 4 in Benhase shows an interface display 400 that “includes a first display region 410 including a tree, and a second display region 420 including a table with rows that provide information associated with nodes of the tree” (see paragraph [0037]). Importantly, Benhase expressly teaches the following:

the nodes of the tree are indicia that represent various storage resources. For example, referring to the corresponding tree 300 of FIG. 3, N0 represents a root node of a storage system “A.” (see paragraph [0037]).

In other words, Benhase teaches that the nodes in the first display region of the tree are storage resources in the storage system, not storage consumers as recited in claim 1. Fig. 4 of Benhase reinforces this teaching by showing servers in the first display region 410. By contrast, claim 1 recites a tree hierarchy region having nodes that correspond to a storage consumer that is allocated storage capacity on the storage domain. This difference is significant. Benhase teaches how storage appears at the servers or storage resources. Claim 1 recites how storage is being used by the consumers. Claim 1 recites that the table portion includes the **allocated storage capacity used by the storage consumer**. Benhase never shows or even suggests showing how storage capacity is used by the storage consumer. Again, Benhase shows how the storage is use at the servers or storage resources.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 19, 29 and their respective dependent claims are allowable over Benhase.

Claims 8, 15, 23, 32

Claims 8, 15, 23, 32 recite numerous limitations that are not taught or suggested in Benhase. Claim 8 is selected for discussion.

By way of example, claim 8 recites that the tree hierarchy portion includes “nodes corresponding to storage consumers that are members having allocated storage capacity on a storage domain” (emphasis added). Benhase does not teach or even suggest these recitations. Fig. 4 in Benhase shows an interface display 400 that “includes a first display region 410 including a tree, and a second display region 420 including a table with rows that provide information associated with nodes of the tree” (see paragraph [0037]). Importantly, Benhase expressly teaches the following:

the nodes of the tree are indicia that represent various storage resources. For example, referring to the corresponding tree 300 of FIG. 3, N0 represents a root node of a storage system “A.” (see paragraph [0037]).

In other words, Benhase teaches that the nodes in the first display region of the tree are storage resources in the storage system, not storage consumers as recited in claim 8. Fig. 4 of Benhase reinforces this teaching by showing servers in the first display region 410. By contrast, claim 8 recites a tree hierarchy portion including nodes corresponding to storage consumers that are members having allocated storage capacity on a storage domain. This difference is significant. Benhase teaches how storage appears at the servers or storage resources. Claim 8 recites how storage is being used by the consumers. Claim 8 recites that the table portion includes an **allotment of storage space to the respective storage consumers**. Benhase never shows or even suggests showing how storage capacity is used by the storage consumer. Again, Benhase shows how the storage is use at the servers or storage resources.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 8, 15, 23, 32 and their respective dependent claims are allowable over Benhase.

As yet another example, independent claim 8 recites “each row being **aligned** with one of the nodes” (emphasis added). Benhase never teaches or even suggests such an alignment. Fig. 4 in Benhase expressly shows that the rows in the second display region 420 are **not** aligned with the nodes in the first display region 410.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 8, 15, 23, 32 and their respective dependent claims are allowable over Benhase.

II. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 9, 10, 17, 18, 24, 25, 33, 34 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benhase in view of USPN 6,832,248 (Byrnes). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Benhase in view of Byrnes and US publication number 2005/0039123 (Kuchinsky). Claim 17 is rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Benhase in view of USPN 6,271,846 (Martinez). These rejections are traversed.

As noted in section I, Benhase does not teach or even suggest all the elements of the independent claims. Byrnes, Kuchinsky, and Martinez fail to cure these deficiencies. Thus, for at least the reasons provided with respect to the independent claims in section I, the rejected dependent claims in section II are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529